MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN
UPDATED

USAID Lifelong Learning

LIFELONG LEARNING PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION
PLAN

UPDATED

Prepared for:

United States Agency for International Development, Guatemala

Contractor:

Juárez y Asociados, Inc.

Prepared by:

Leslie Rosales

and

Ray Chesterfield

August 2014

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

This document presents plan for monitoring the Lifelong Learning Project contractor's performance in contributing to improve reading skills and access for young people to non-traditional education programs. The initial section of the plan includes an overview of the project within the context of the USAID Education Strategy and the Guatemala Mission's development strategy; a detailed description of indicators to be used and a template with indicator targets. Subsequent sections describe the evaluation activities that will be conducted to inform initiative design and measure project performance and impact. A final section of the plan describes the applied research activities that will be carried out to fine tune project interventions and to aid in explaining project results.

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Overview
The Lifelong Learning Project builds on previous USAID investments to improve education quality and access in Guatemala that established learning standards, improved the MOE capacity to delivery educational services at the classroom level, and created tools for advancing intercultural bilingual education. The project directly supports the USAID Education Strategy goals of "Improved reading skills for 100 million children in primary grades by 2015" and "Increased equitable access to education in crisis and conflict environments for 15 million of learners by 2015", as well as the Mission Objective 2": Improved Levels of Economic Growth and Social Development in the Western Highlands", by targeting the creation of learning opportunities for underserved populations such as early primary students in bilingual classrooms and out-of-school youth in the Western Highlands. Meeting this objective requires analysis and documentation of the situation of children and youth of different sexes and/or linguistic abilities within school and community contexts in order to apply existing tools and knowledge to overcoming structural and institutional constraints to learning and participation.

Juárez and Associates in assisting the Ministry of Education and other appropriate Guatemalan government agencies in carrying out the Lifelong Learning Project. Juárez and Associates has for several years worked with USAID and the Guatemalan Ministry of Education in the creation and validation of grade-level educational standards, a national curriculum and measures of student performance based on the new curriculum and standards, as well as in strengthening service delivery and opportunities to learn in the classroom. This experience will be used to improve early reading skills for children in precarious economic conditions, whose first language may not be the national language of instruction, while strengthening regional and national systems within a country to sustain long-term primary reading outcomes, as well as to strengthen existing options and create new learning, occupational, and civic participation alternatives for youth.

The project is designed on evidence that shows reading to be the foundation of lifelong learning, and investments in early grade reading having a high rate of return. This is especially true in bilingual contexts where dropout in the first grade is high as students try to cope with a language of instruction that is often not their maternal tongue. Thus, interventions in early grades will reduce dropout and contribute to increased completion rates in primary school and lead to greater enrollment rates in secondary education. In Guatemala, low coverage rates in secondary education are a product of severe quality challenges in primary education, as opposed to a coverage problem in secondary. The project will use an opportunities to learn paradigm in designing interventions and monitoring and evaluation efforts. This paradigm is rooted in an understanding of structural and institutional constraints that influence learning to read in specific social contexts. Reading is viewed not as an isolated skill to be acquired in a particular location, but as a critical element in the formation of flexible skills for critical thinking, decision-making/leadership, participation and entrepreneurship.

Thus, monitoring, evaluation and applied research efforts carried out by the project will be integrated to explain performance and impact of project interventions within context of the Guatemalan Western Highlands, as well as monitor the implementation of project interventions over time. Findings from these three analysis tools will be disseminated at different levels of the education system to ensure participation of implementers and beneficiaries in the ongoing improvement of interventions. Such learning activities will take place through research and topline reports to USAID and high-level MOE and other ministry decision-makers, use of public media such as web sites and newspaper special sections, as appropriate, regional and local report summaries and graphical presentations for school and youth training personnel, and community forums of different types for community members, youth, and students.

II. MONITORING PLAN

This section presents the indicators to be monitored by the project. A tabular format is used to present the indicators, describe their characteristics, and discuss measurement issues and disaggregation. Additional tables are used to present the yearly monitoring targets. The section concludes with a discussion of assumptions about the monitoring activities.

Component A Indicator descriptions

Number	USAID Goal 1 standard indicator 3.2.1-27
Indicator	**Percentage of students in target areas who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text.**
Definition	Direct effect: Total number of students in second grade in target schools with positive growth profile (positive gains by the end of second grade and/or an SGP above 50th percentile and/or achieved the second grade standards in mother tongue and second language) divided by all second grade students in these schools. Student progress will be measured against a counterfactual group of second graders. Indirect effect: Total number of students in second grade in national elementary sample who achieve the standard for the grade over students in a national elementary school sample who do not achieve the standard.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures student progress towards national standards in reading. Improved reading will contribute in greater success in school, especially in decreasing the high dropout rate in first grade. Ultimately this will result in higher primary graduation rates and the opportunity to pursue higher levels of education.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage
Use of Indicator	The indicator will be used to determine the effectiveness of project interventions in early bilingual reading.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Yearly project report on indicator progress.
Known Data Limitations	Data will be collected with a standardized instrument that has been shown to be highly valid and reliable by the MOE evaluation division. The MOE evaluation division has built in data quality controls to ensure precision. Timeliness pre and post anually data

	collection consistent with school year- no issues.
Baseline Timeframe	Feb 2015
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, Ethnicity, and Direct/indirect effects

Number	USAID Goal 1 standard indicator 3.2.1-28
Indicator	**Percentage of students in target areas who, by the end of the primary cycle, are able to read and demonstrate understanding as defined by the country curriculum, standards or national experts.**
Definition	Direct effect: Total number of students in third grade in target schools with positive growth profile (positive gains by the end of third grade and/or an SGP above 50th percentile and/or achieved third grade standards in mother tongue and second language) divided by all second grade students in these schools. Student progress will be measured against a counterfactual group of third graders.*The progress of students at third grade has been used for this indicator as the interventions of the project will not affect the student population in higher grades during the length of project.* Indirect effect: Total number of students in third grade in national elementary sample who achieve the standard for the grade over students in national elementary sample who do not achieve the standard.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures student progress towards national standards in reading at the end of the early primary cycle. Improved reading will contribute in greater success in school, ultimately this will result in higher primary graduation rates and the opportunity to pursue higher levels of education.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage
Use of Indicator	The indicator will be used to determine the effectiveness of project interventions in helping students to reach grade level standards at third grade.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Yearly project report on indicator progress.
Known Data Limitations	Data will be collected with a standardized instrument that has been shown to be highly valid and reliable by the MOE evaluation division. The MOE evaluation division has built in data quality controls to ensure precision. Timeliness pre and post anually data collection consistent with school year- no issues.

Baseline Timeframe	Feb 2015
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, Ethnicity, and direct/indirect effects

Number	New indicator
Indicator	**Percentage of students who complete second grade.**
Definition	Total number of students in a cohort who complete second grade in two years, divided by the number of students enrolled in first grade in the initial cohort year. Progress will be measured in relation to a counterfactual group.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures student success in staying in school. Normal progress in school offers greater interaction with reading content, thereby enhancing the ability of long term school completion and achievement.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage
Use of Indicator	Indicator used to measure effectiveness of interventions in overcoming early grade dropout, especially first grade where dropout is very high.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	School enrollment and completion data. Annually
Known Data Limitations	A standard definition of "dropout" will be used to ensure validity. Standard data collection procedures will be used to ensure reliability and precision. Timeliness pre and post anually data collection consistent with school year- no issues.
Baseline Timeframe	Feb 2015
Disaggregate(s)	Sex and Ethnicity

Number	USAID Goal 1 standard indicator 3.21-35
Indicator	**Number of learners receiving instruction from teachers using reading interventions at the primary level.**
Definition	Direct effect: Total number of students taught by teachers who apply reading interventions in the classroom. Appropiate application of interventions will be determined through analysis of self report data collected on teachers as part of the student testing process. Furthermore, teachers that receive intervention will be tracked during project years. Indirect effect: Total number of students in national elementary sample taught by teachers who appropriately apply a reading model intervention in the classroom. Appropiate application of interventions will be determined through analysis of self report data collected on teachers as part of MOE's testing process, and criteria for an acceptable level of appropriate practices will be established.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Classroom interventions will be designed to promote good teaching practices. Good teaching practice in classroom management, reading skills development and multiple language adquisition have been shown to contribute to student academic success.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	This indicator will measure the breath of good teaching practice across the target student population.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Yearly project report on indicator pogress.
Known Data Limitations	Data will be collected a through teacher questionnaire that will be piloted to ensure valid and reliable in the target context. Counts of students will be based on class enrollment data, therefore precision is not an issue. Data will be collected consistent with the yearly teaching cycle, therefore timeliness is not an issue.
Baseline Timeframe	Implementation of project interventions will begin in 2015. Thus, as no teachers have received interventions, baseline is zero in 2014. Initial data on this indicator will be collected on September 2015.

Disaggregate(s)	Sex, ethnicity, and Direct/indirect effects

Number	USAID Goal 1 standard indicator 3.2.1-33
Indicator	**Number of textbooks and teaching and learning materials (TLM) provided and adapted with USG support.**
Definition	Direct effect: Total number of titles of teacher guides and auxiliary instructional and assessment materials as well as student learning enhancement aids developed by the project that complement existing texts. Indirect effect: Total number of titles of teacher guides and auxiliary instructional and assessment materials as well as student learning enhancement aids developed by the project used by education service providers outside the project.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Resources that serve as a reference to good practice help ensure the quality of instructional delivery, whereas materials that increase learning opportunities contribute to academic success in reading and writing.
Indicator Type	Input
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	This is a measure of the progress in enhancing learning opportunities in classroomss of the target areas. The data will be combined with other measures to determine the relationship of the indicator to improving student reading.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reports of the data implementation team, reports from other institutions on the use of use of the materials. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	This is a count, there are no data limitation issues.
Baseline Timeframe	Measurement will begin September 2015.
Disaggregate(s)	Direct/indirect effects

Number	3.2.1-38
Indicator	**Number of laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines developed or modified to improve primary grade reading programs or increase equitable access.**
Definition	This indicator has been removed.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	
Unit of Measure	
Use of Indicator	
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	

Number	USAID Goal 1 standard indicator 3.2.1-34
Indicator	**Number of standardized learning assessments supported by USG.**
Definition	Total number of learning assessments using primary and secondary data carried out with student populations in the target area.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a direct measure of the impact of improved education services on student learning.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Indicator will be used for decisions regarding teaching interventions.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Learning assessments instruments, including National Second Grade Reading Assessment, Functional Literacy Assessment, Functional Numeracy Assessment, Early Grade Reading Assessment in Mam, and LEE. Annually
Known Data Limitations	The majority of the instruments have been found to be valid and reliable over a number of years of use. New instruments will be extensively piloted to determine psychometric properties.
Baseline Timeframe	FY2014
Disaggregate(s)	Not applicable

Number	USAID Goal 1 standard indicator 3.2.1-31
Indicator	**Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully completed in-service training, or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support.**
Definition	Direct training: Total number of teachers who receive at least 16 hours in bilingual reading instruction through in-service professional development, mentoring, or intensive coaching.

In-service training is a structured professional development activity that is administered by a regional or national educational authority, such as a university. It has a well defined and timeframe. Coaching is an informal modality of enhancing teachers' capacity; in general it is done in small group or face-to-face settings. Furthermore it focuses on specific necessities of teachers. Coaching in general is a product of in-service training that outreaches other teachers. There is a possibility under program intervention that teachers receive both modalities; in which case, each 16- hours of instruction will be counted separately.

Indirect training: Total number of teachers who receive at least 16 hours in bilingual reading instruction through MOE programs outside the project.

Indirect training implies that the MOE has taken this intervation to scale through one of its training programs (PADEP, SINAE). |
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a measure of the enhanced capacity of teachers to deliver instructional content using effective teaching practice. Good teaching practice has been shown to improve academic achievement among students.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	This is a measure of enhanced capacity of teachers to expand learning opportunities in classrooms of the target areas. The data will be combined with other measures to determine the relationship of the indicator to improved student reading.

Data Source and Reporting Frequency	PADEP, oficial records from MOE, and project training reports. Annually at the end of fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirement.
Known Data Limitations	This is a count, there are no reliability, validity or timeliness issues. However, there is a known desertion index of about 25% to 30% of the teachers in training programs that potentially could affect this indicator.
Baseline Timeframe	As the indicator will measure new training, baseline is zero. Training will begin in January 2015. Reporting will begin in September 2015.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, ethnicity, Direct/indirect effects, and in-service training/coaching.

Number	USAID Goal 1 standard indicator 3.2.1-3
Indicator	**Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support.**
Definition	Direct training: Total number of regional administrators, including school directors, and officials who receive at least 16 hours of training under the auspices of the Project. Training may take place through courses, or outreach/coaching in implementation of bilingual education interventions of the project. Indirect training: Total number of regional administrators, including school directors, and officials who receive at least 16 hours of training developed by the project through other MOE programs. Indirect training implies that the MOE has taken this intervation to scale through one of its training programs (PADEP, SINAE).
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a measure of the enhanced capacity of national/regional administrators or officials to support effective teaching practice. Good teaching practice has been shown to improve academic achievement among students. Increased technical and administrator capacity will facilitate scaling up of successful interventions.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Measure of enhanced capacity within the regional education system to effectively implement and manage bilingual education interventions of the project.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project training reports and oficial records from MOE. Annually at the end of fiscal year to coincide with USAID reporting requirement.
Known Data Limitations	This is a count, there are no data limitations issues.
Baseline Timeframe	As the indicator will measure new training, baseline is zero. Training will begin in January 2015. Reporting will begin in September 2015.

Disaggregate(s)	Sex, ethnicity, direct/indirect effects, in-service/coaching.

Number	A3.1 (no number)
Indicator	**Percentage of parents who articulate actions they can carry out to support children's reading.**
Definition	Total number of parents who describe support of children's reading out of total parents interviewed in schools in target areas.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Parent participation in education has been shown to be related to student academic achievement when participation is directly tied to learning of subject matter. Parental knowledge of the effect of their contributions to student learning can lead to permanent community support of learning in the classroom.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage
Use of Indicator	This indicator will determine the effectiveness of the project interventions at the community level.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Survey of a sample of parents administered at the time of student testing. Annually
Known Data Limitations	Validity and reliability will be determined during piloting of the baseline survey of the project. Precision will be ensured through a variaty of quality control strategies during data collection. Timeliness is not an issue.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline FY2014.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Number	A3.2 (no number)
Indicator	**The percentage of parents who identify content of community awareness campaign.**
Definition	Total number of parents who identify content of community awareness campaign out of total parents interviewed in schools in target areas.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a measure of the spread of information about the importance of reading in target areas. Awareness is a first step in encouraging parental participation.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage
Use of Indicator	The data will be combined with other measures to determine the relationship of the indicator to improved parent participation.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Survey of a sample of parents administered at the time of student testing. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	Validity and reliability will be determined during piloting of the baseline survey of the project. Precision will be ensured through a variaty of quality control strategies during data collection.
Baseline Timeframe	FY2014.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Number	A3.3 (no number)
Indicator	**The percentage of third graders that report reading is practiced at home.**
Definition	This indicador has been eliminated as the subcomponent focused in community and parental participations rather than students
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	
Unit of Measure	
Use of Indicator	
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	

Component B indicator descriptors

Number	Component B indicator 1
Indicator	**Number out of learners enrolled in secondary schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USG support.**
Definition	Total number of learners between the ages of 15 to 24 in target areas above a 2014 baseline who enroll in secondary schools or equivalent non-school based settings. The baseline will be determined on projections of the national census and or ENCOVI, minus those enrolled in secondary school = OSY and field assessmesnts, which includes estimates for population growth.

Concretely, OSY in this indicator is defined as:

An Out of School Youth is an individula who was not enrolled in secondary school, alternative education programs or job training programs in a given year, but enters one such program in the subsequent year. |
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Increased participation of out of school youth in learning opportunities will increase the possibility of additional education and/or workforce participation, leading to increased economic opportunities.
Indicator Type	Input
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	This is a measure of youth participation in learning opportunities. This measure will be combined with other data to examine the effectiviness of the post primary learning opportunities provided through the project.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Enrollment records of non-school equivalent programs participating with the project and records from MOE. Annually
Known Data Limitations	Indicator has high face validity in terms of the goals of the project. There are no reliability issues because it is a count. As national and regional estimates will be used, a + or - 5% error of measurement will be used to ensure precision. Timeliness- no issues.

Baseline Timeframe	Baseline September 2014.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex.

Number	Component B indicator 2
Indicator	**Number of youth who qualify for higher level general education.**
Definition	Total number of learners between the ages of 15 to 24 in target areas above a 2014 baseline who enroll in secondary schools or equivalent non-school based settings and receive a completion certificate.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	A certificate of completion offers the possibility of enrollment in a higher level of education and broader employment opportunities, leading to increased economic opportunities.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	This is a measure of participant commitment to increase learning. The measure will be combined with other data to examine the effectiveness of the post primary learning opportunities offered through the project.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Enrollment and completion records of non-school equivalent programs participating with the project and records from MOE. Annually
Known Data Limitations	This is a count there are no issues.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline September 2014.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex.

Number	Component B indicator 3
Indicator	**Number and percentage of youth completing USAID employability training placed in jobs within 6 months.**
Definition	This indicator consists of two measures: 1) The total number of participants under 24 years of age who find employment (including self-employment)within 6 months of completing employability training through the project in a given training cycle; 2) The total number of participants who find jobs in 6 months divided by all participants who complete programs in a given cycle.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a measure of the effectiveness of training in increasing employment opportunities. Employment will lead to greater economic security.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number and percentage
Use of Indicator	To track training effectiveness of training programs and to adjust program offerings if necessary.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project tracking system and follow-up through telephone interviews. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	There are no data limitations as this indicator relies on counts
Baseline Timeframe	FY 2014
Disaggregate(s)	By sex and program

Number	Required: Component B indicator 3
Indicator	**Number of youth receiving new or better employment (including better self employment) as a result of participation in USG funded workforce development project.**
Definition	Eliminated after discussions with Education CTOR because of duplication with the previous indicator.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	
Unit of Measure	
Use of Indicator	
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	

Number	Component B indicator 4
Indicator	**Quality standards developed for functional literacy and numeracy, life skills, workforce readiness, and civic engagement in livelihoods programs.**
Definition	Criteria that reflect programatic characteristics related to good instructional delivery and student outcomes in each content area.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Quality standards are a tool for identifying successful programs in the targeted content areas. Long-term the tool will be used by appropriate ministries in the certification of programs dealing with out of school youth.
Indicator Type	Yes/no
Unit of Measure	Presence or absence
Use of Indicator	This indicator will be used to monitor change over time in instructional delivery and post program support.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	NA
Known Data Limitations	NA
Baseline Timeframe	As the standards haven't been developed, baseline is zero.
Disaggregate(s)	NA

Number	Component B indicator 5
Indicator	**Percentage of USAID-supported alternative basic education and workforce training programs meeting defined quality standards.**
Definition	Total number of participating programs that achieve acceptable results on a performance quality review based on the standards, divided by all participating programs in the project.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Determination and standardization of programatic characteristics leading to successful outcomes.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage
Use of Indicator	Determination of improvement in program quality.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Performance quality review. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	Validity will be established through panel of experts in the content area. Reliability will be determined by measuring the consistency of ratings among reviewers and across program. Acceptable standards of interrater agreement will be used to ensure precision. Timeliness is not an issue.
Baseline Timeframe	As all programs will be new participants in the project, baseline is zero.
Disaggregate(s)	NA

Number	Component B indicator 6
Indicator	**Systems created and in use to train support and monitor teachers and instructors.**
Definition	This indicator is part of the activities of monitoring the quality of programs participating with the project discussed previously under standard development. We therfore recommend the elimination of this indicator as it is duplicative.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	
Unit of Measure	
Use of Indicator	
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	

Number	Component B indicator 7
Indicator	**Number of educators, trainers, and mentors mobilized and trained to support out-of-school youth.**
Definition	Total number of individuals working with youth who receive at least 16 hours of training in content delivery and/or outreach to youth through project initiatives. Participation in the training is the measure of mobilization.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Measure of enhanced capacity within the target areas to provide useable abilities and skills to young people who are not attending school. Increased skills and abilities can improve access to further learning and employment.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Indicator results will be combined with other data to determine the effectiveness of training.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project training reports. Annually
Known Data Limitations	This is a count. There are no data limitations.
Baseline Timeframe	The baseline is zero as no one has been trained under the project to date.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Number	Component B indicator 8
Indicator	**Person hours of training completed in workforce development supported by USG assistance.**
Definition	The number of hours of training received by each individual who participates in workforce development training carried out under the project. All hours will be counted even for individuals who did not complete training.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Measure of enhanced capacity within the target areas to provide workforce skills to young people who are not attending school. Increased workforce skills can improve access to future employment and ocupational advancement.
Indicator Type	Input
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Track donor investment in target area.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Training organizations annual reports. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	There are no limitations because it is a count.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is zero.
Disaggregate(s)	Not applicable.

Number	Component B indicator 9
Indicator	**Percentage of youth enrolled in supported training programs acquiring basic competencies.**
Definition	Total number of participants between 15 and 24 who successfully complete project training programs, divided by all youth who enroll in those programs. Individuals who enroll in more than one program will be counted separately for each enrollment.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Completion offers the possibility of better employment opportunities, leading to increased economic opportunities.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage
Use of Indicator	This is a measure of participant commitment to increase learning. The measure will be combined with other data to examine the effectiviness of the post primary learning opportunities.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Participant tracking system. Annually
Known Data Limitations	No validity, reliability or timeliness issues. Precision may be affected by missing participants.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is zero.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Number	Component B indicator 10
Indicator	**Number of youth reached with reproductive health and family planning education and counseling.**
Definition	Total number of individuals between 15 and 24 who participate in project initiatives that provide content relative to reproductive health and family planning.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Knowledge about reproductive health and family planning can contribute to youth decisions about life opportunities, which may improve future social and economic possibilities.
Indicator Type	Input
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	This is a measure of increased knowledge. The measure will be combined with other data to examine behavior of participants.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Participant enrollment data. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	There are no data limitations because is a simple count.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is zero.
Disaggregate(s)	By Sex.

Number	Component B indicator 11
Indicator	**Number of strategies to alliviate barriers to accessing alternative education.**
Definition	Total number of initiatives carried out by the project which enhace awareness (in terms of knowledge of program existance, and the potential opportunities available through program participation) and access (through alternative delivery systems and assistance in meeting requirements to governmental opportunities).
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Greater knowledge of the range of programs and the obtention of documentation necessary for participation can increase social and economic long term envolvement.
Indicator Type	Input
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Effectiveness of the strategies will be monitored to make decisions about going to scale.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project reports. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	There are no data limitations because is a simple count.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is zero.
Disaggregate(s)	NA

Number	Component B indicator 12
Indicator	**Number of youth volunteer service hours completed.**
Definition	The number of hours of volunteer service given by each individual, between 15 and 24 years of age, who participates in project activities.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a measure of capacity for youth engagement in community support within the target areas. Early experience with engagement may contribute to lifelong civic participation.
Indicator Type	Input
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Track youth envolvement in target areas.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project reports. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	There are no limitations because it is a count.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is zero.
Disaggregate(s)	Not applicable.

Number	Component B indicator 13
Indicator	**Number of youth organizations that have youth involved in operational decisions (We suggest that the original indicator in the Project Monitoring Plan Evaluation be modified to the above, this change allows the inclusion of organizations created by youth as well as those serving youth).**
Definition	Total number of organizations identified the description of the Youth Civic Participation Implementation document that have youth as board members, advisors, etc.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Youth participation is been shown to increase the quality of youth programming.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Track youth envolvement in target areas.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project reports. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	There are no limitations because it is a count.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is zero.
Disaggregate(s)	Not applicable.

Number	Component B indicator 14
Indicator	**Number of guidelines or regulations that have been shaped by representative youth engagement in local level.**
Definition	This indicator should be eliminated because the modification in the previous indicator includes youth participation and operational decisions.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	
Unit of Measure	
Use of Indicator	
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	

Number	Component B indicator 15
Indicator	**Percentage of youth who identify engagement opportunities for themselves.**
Definition	Total number of youth involved in project initiatives who identify potential or actual engagement opportunities for themselves, divided by total number of youth participating in project initiatives. Engagement opportunities will be measured through open-ended questions. A authomatized system to code responses will be used to determined the number of youth who identify engagement opportunities. The Participatory Youth Assessment will provide a first operational definition of the youth engagement.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Youth participation is been shown to increase the quality of youth programming.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage
Use of Indicator	Measure of disposition towards engagement. This measure will be combined with other data to examine effectiveness of program activities.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Baseline survey and project participation report. Annually.
Known Data Limitations	There are two potential data limitations: 1) there might be no opportunities that are sufficiently attractive to youth to engage in them, and 2) responses might be influenced by social desirability issues.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline will be the Participatory Youth Assessment FY14.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex.

Monitoring Targets

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
Goal	3.2.1-27	**Percentage of students in target areas who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text.**		1%		2%		3%		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
Goal	3.2.1-28	**Percentage of students in target areas who, by the end of the primary cycle, are able to read and demonstrate understanding as defined by the country curriculum, standards or national experts.**		1%		2%		4%		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
Sub-component A.1	New indicator	**Percentage of students who complete second grade.**				3%		5%		
	3.21-35	**Number of learners receiving instruction from teachers using reading interventions at the primary level.**		6,000		8,000		4,000		
	3.2.1-33	**Number of textbook and teaching and learning materials (TLM) provided and adapted with USG support.**		8		8		2		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
	3.2.1-38	**Number of laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines developed or modified to improve primary grade reading programs or increase equitable access.**		3		5		3		
	3.2.1-34	**Number of standardized learning assessment supported by USG.**		4		4		4		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
Subcomponent A.2	3.2.1-31	**Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully completed in-service training, or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support.**		270		297		245		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
	3.2.1-3	**Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support.**		50		50		50		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
Subcomponent A.3.	A3_TBD_1	**Percentage of parents who articulate actions they can carry out to support children's reading.**		20%		35%		40%		
	A3_TBD_2	**The percentage of parents who identify content of community awareness campaign.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		
	A3_TBD_3	**The percentage of third graders that report reading is practiced at home.**								

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
Goal	B1	**Number out of learners enrolled in secondary schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USG support.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		
	B2	**Number of youth who qualify for higher-level general education.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
Goal	Required: B3	**Number and percentage of youth completing USAID employability training placed in jobs within 6 months.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
Subcomponent B.1	B4	**Quality standards developed for functional literacy and numeracy, life skills, workforce readiness, and civic engagement in livelihoods programs.**		YES		YES		YES		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
	B5	**Percentage of USAID-supported alternative basic education and workforce training programs meeting defined quality standards.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
	B6	**Systems created and in use to train support and monitor teachers and instructors.**		YES		YES		YES		
	B7	**Number of educators, trainers, and mentors mobilized and trained to support out-of-school youth**		TBD		TBD		TBD		
	B8	**Person hours of training completed in workforce development supported by USG assistance.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
	B9	**Percentage of youth enrolled in supported training programs acquiring basic competencies.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		
	B10	**Number of youth reached with reproductive health and family planning education and counseling.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		
	B11	**Number of strategies to alleviate barriers to accessing alternative education.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
	B12	**Number of youth volunteer service hours completed.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		
Subcomponent B.3	B13	**Number of youth-involved organizations that have youth involved in operational decisions (We suggest that the original indicator in the Project Monitoring Plan Evaluation be modified to the above,**		TBD		TBD		TBD		

		this change allows the inclusion of organizations created by youth as well as those serving youth).								

Logical Framework Level	Number	Indicator	Baseline Year	FY15/TARGET	FY15/ACTUAL	FY16/TARGET	FY16/ACTUAL	FY17/TARGET	FY17/ACTUAL	Life program
	B14	**Number of guidelines or regulations that have been shaped by representative youth engagement in local level.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		
	B15	**Percentage of youth who identify engagement opportunities for themselves.**		TBD		TBD		TBD		

Monitoring Assumption

The principal assumptions made in developing indicators are that an adequate counterfactual group of schools and students can be found to make comparisons and tests to measure reading growth will be completed and tested in time to collect pretest data at the beginning of the school year. It is unlikely that schools and certainly not students can be randomized. Thus, criteria related to school quality will be developed and schools in areas outside the project catchment area will be matched to schools in which the project is working, Ideally, the second grade tests will be developed in consort with the MOE evaluation division. However, as this division may be subject to other priorities within the MOE, the project will develop the tests, if necessary, and vet them with DIGEDUCA

III.   EVALUATION PLAN

This section presents the Lifelong Learning project evaluation plan. The evaluation plan complements the project Monitoring Plan. The monitoring plan is designed to provide information to project implementers on the degree to which the program as implemented is meeting its objectives. It uses key indicators key to understand how well a program is moving toward its objectives so that changes can be made in the program's components, as necessary to improve procedures and activities.

Evaluation, on the other hand, has the goal to collect and present information for summary statements which allow judgments to be made about the value of a program or certain program components. The project will conduct two types of evaluations – performance and impact. The remainder of this document discusses the questions to be answered through each type of evaluation, summarizes the design of each of the evaluations to be conducted, and presents a timeline for carrying out the evaluations over the life of the project.

Priority Evaluation Questions

The project will conduct performance and impact evaluations. Performance evaluation will be of two types: 1) post-hoc examinations of program effects for initiatives carried out under the Education Reform in the Classroom project and 2) a determination of program effects of initiatives undertaken by the Lifelong Learning project. Impact evaluations will determine the effects of the project the growth of language abilities of children in the first three grades of primary school in bilingual settings and the strengthening of service delivery of organizations working with youth who participate in the project.

A. Performance Evaluation Questions

The questions for the *post hoc* performance evaluations and the performance evaluations of project activities are similar. They deal with what particular interventions has achieved, whether these achievements were consistent with expected results, what project components have contributed to the achievements and the implications of the findings for further implementation and expansion. Performance evaluation questions Include:

What were the program's goals and objectives?

What were the program's most important characteristics--materials, staffing, activities, administrative arrangements?

How were the program activities supposed to lead to the attainment of its objectives?

Were the program's important characteristics implemented?

Did the program components contribute to achievement of the objectives?

Which activities or combination best accomplished each objective?

What adjustments in program management and support (staff development, incentives, etc.) were needed?

Was the program or some aspects of it better suited to certain types of participants?

What problems were there and how were they solved?

What design changes can be recommended for program expansion?

B. Performance Evaluation Activities

<u>Performance evaluation of the Reaula municipal Library activity.</u> The evaluation will be undertaken with the universe of libraries in the Western Highlands that participated in the Reaula project. The principal instruments will be inventories and open-ended topical interviews. Inventories will be used for cataloging existing materials. Interviews will be developed for librarians, local authorities involved with the libraries, and users of library services. Interview topics will deal with the continuation of activities initiated under the project, new activities, changes in users and materials, and funding sources, and perception of users of the services offered. Retrospective questions will be used to examine the before and after conditions of the libraries. Data will be coded and analyzed by the project team. Data will be presented in terms of graphical displays. The evaluation will take during third and fourth quarters of FY 2014.

Performance evaluation of the Reaula professional development training efforts. As the training supported by Reaula included MA degree leadership programs for trainers of trainers, specialization courses for pedagogical outreach personnel in targeted departments, and post-secondary courses in reading and/or mathematics instruction for teachers, this evaluation will use a rapid assessment methodology with a small sample of individuals completing each type of training modality. Data will also be collected on a small sample of the trainers and administrators for each modality. Interviews with trainees will deal with their use of the training in their current professional endeavors and those aspects of training which were of the greatest utility in their work. Questions for administrators and trainers will deal with challenges encountered in implementing the training program and changes that would be helpful in new training efforts of a similar type. Data will be coded for key performance variables, and when appropriate, aggregated across program type. Gender differences among the trainee sample will also be examined. This evaluation will take place in the last quarter of FY 2014 and the first quarter of FY 2015.

Performance Evaluation of the Community Involvement in Early Grade Reading Activity of the Lifelong Learning Project. The evaluation will examine the intervention carried out with community members in schools implementing the bilingual reading model developed by the project. As an assessment of current community participation in early school reading in the target areas is planned for early FY 2015, this assessment will serve as a baseline for the evaluation. Assessment data will be used to select communities with project schools and those without. A sample of treatment and comparison schools will be drawn from each sample. Sample members of both groups will be interviewed as to their participation in the reading of school children in the early grades, whereas community members in project schools will also be asked about those aspects of the program that contributed to their participation. Local administrators and school personnel will also be interviewed about effective aspects of the project program. Performance data will be collected at the end of the 2016 school year, so that findings can be incorporated into program adjustments.

Performance Evaluation of the Youth Civic Involvement Activity of the Lifelong Learning Project. The evaluation will deal with the elements and outcomes of the project intervention to promote youth involvement in carrying out actions that benefit their communities in the target areas. The Participatory Assessment of Youth in the target areas, to be carried out in the last quarter of FY 2014, will serve as the baseline for determining the range of youth activities and the degree of involvement of youths. The assessment will be used to draw a sample of youth who participate in the project activity and youths who did not participation in the activity. Youths will be interviewed in terms of types of actions in which they were involved, the outcomes of their actions, leadership roles in carrying out the actions, the aspects of the project activity that contributed to the outcomes, and plans for the future based on participation in the action. Partners in and beneficiaries of the actions will also be interviewed as to their view of the

outcomes of actions and the role of the project activities. Comparison group youths will be asked about their involvement with the community and activities which supported such actions. Performance data will be collected at the end of FY 2016 in order to make adjustments in the activity in the last year of the first phase of the project.

C. Impact Evaluation Questions

Although different development outcomes will be evaluated with the two planned impact evaluations – improved reading among early grade primary school beneficiaries and improved quality of program service delivery for youth – the impact evaluation questions are similar. They include:

Did the planned program occur?

Did the program lead to the desired development outcome?

What were the program's most important characteristics, activities, services, staffing, and administrative arrangements?

What conclusions can be made about the effects of program or its various components?

What programs are available as alternatives to the program?

How effective was the program in comparison with alternative programs?

Was the program differentially effective with particular types of participants and/or in particular locales?

D. Impact Evaluation Activities

As mentioned, two impact evaluations are planned for project activities. One evaluation will determine the effect of bilingual classroom interventions on the reading skills of students in early primary grades. The second impact evaluation will determine the effects of program interventions on improving the delivery of instructional content of programs dealing with out-of-school youth.

Impact Evaluation of Student Reading Growth. The evaluation will measure the reading skill growth of a longitudinal sample of first, second and third graders over the life of the project. Intact classrooms of students in a random sample of schools within the municipalities participating in the project will serve as the treatment group. A comparison group of intact classrooms nested within schools not participating in the project will also be selected. Data on reading skills will be collected annually beginning with a baseline at the beginning of the 2015 school year. Information on materials, teacher professional development, and parent participation will also be collected. The project will work with the MOE evaluation unit in the instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis to ensure that evaluation procedures are institutionalized.

Impact Evaluation of Youth Organization Quality. The evaluation will measure the change in quality of service delivery among organizations working with the project to provide services to out-of-school youth. The instrument based on quality standards for youth organizations to be developed under the project will be used to measure quality. Participating organizations will judged against similar organizations in the pool of applicant organizations that did not participate in the project. Data will also be collected on institutional strengthening activities of the comparison organizations to determine differences from project activities. The post-test only evaluation design will take place during FY 2017.

E. Evaluation Schedule

FY	2014		2015				2016				2017			
Quarter	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Performance Evaluations														
Libraries	X	X												
Professional Development		X	X											

FY	2014		2015				2016				2017			
Quarter	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Community Participation			X					X						
Youth Involvement		X						X						
Impact Evaluations														
Early Reading			X		X					X				X
Organization Strengthening												X		

F. Quality Control Procedures

To ensure quality, all evaluations will be conducted in a manner that is consonant with the norms and procedures of social science, such as the protection of research subjects, careful sampling, the use of valid and reliable instruments, quality control of data collection and analysis, and attention to sources of bias and error in findings.

Specifically, quality controls will include extensive testing of the instruments to ensure reliability, as well as training and retraining of fieldworkers for each data collection activity. Fieldworker training will include: Familiarizing the fieldworkers with the objectives of the project and the evaluation: role management during data collection; techniques for testing young children, interviewing, and classroom observations, as necessary; and simulations of all aspects of the fieldwork during train. Field supervisors will schedule visits, conduct parallel data collection with individual fieldworkers, and review instruments as further quality control measures. Whenever possible, data will be entered digitally in the field to reduce potential processing errors.

G. Evaluation Sharing and Dissemination

Sharing and reporting of evaluation findings will be similar to the strategies used for monitoring results. Dissemination will take place through several complementary activities. These include: research and topline reports to USAID and high-level MOE and other ministry decision-makers; technical reports for USAID evaluation specialists; use of

public media such as web sites and newspaper special sections, as appropriate; regional and local report summaries and graphical presentations for school and youth training personnel; and community forums of different types for community members, youth, and students.